

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00644 01 OF 02 061942Z

46

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 057278

R 061735Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 9964

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0644

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: DUTCH PAPER ON DATA : SPC DISCUSSION FEBRUARY 6

REF: USNATO 536

SUMMARY: SPC ON FEBRUARY 6 DISCUSSED DUTCH PAPER ON ALTERNATIVES TO AN EXCHANGE OF DATA WITH THE OTHER SIDE (REFTEL). CANADIAN, UK, AND FRG REPS, ON INSTRUCTIONS, SUPPORTED THE CONTINUATION OF ALLIED EFFORTS TO ENGAGE THE OTHER SIDE IN AN EXCHANGE OF DATA, BUT AGREED WITH DUTCH PROPOSAL THAT THE SPC ASK THE MBFR WORKING GROUP TO EXAMINE MILITARY-TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE DUTCH PAPER. NETHERLANDS REP STRESSED THAT DUTCH CONSIDERED THEIR PAPER A THINK-PIECE, AND HAD NO INTENTION OF PROPOSING A CHANGE IN GUIDANCE TO THE AHG. SPC ON FEBRUARY 10 WILL AGAIN CONSIDER SENDING DUTCH PROPOSAL TO MBFR WG. GUIDANCE REQUESTED.
END SUMMARY

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00644 01 OF 02 061942Z

1. CANADIAN REP (ROY) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES HAD READ WITH INTEREST THE DUTCH PROPOSAL, AND GENERALLY AGREED WITH THE FIRST TWO PARAGRAPHS OF THE DUTCH TEXT. HOWEVER, OTTAWA HAD A PROBLEM WITH PARA 4 OF THE DUTCH TEXT WHICH SUGGESTED REACHING

AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS WITHOUT SPECIFYING THE COMMON CEILING, OR AGREEING ON THE COMMON CEILING WITHOUT SPECIFYING REDUCTIONS. THE TIME HAD NOT COME TO ADOPT THE MINIMALIST APPROACH ON EXCHANGE OF DATA SET FORTH IN THAT PARAGRAPH. THE AHG SHOULD CONTINUE TO PRESS FOR AN EXCHANGE OF DATA ON THE PRESENT BASIS. THERE IS STILL A POSSIBILITY OF A DATA EXCHANGE WITH THE EAST. THE PRESENT ALLIED APPROACH ON DATA IS DEFENDABLE WITH PUBLIC OPINION, AND PLACES THE OTHER SIDE ON THE DEFENSIVE. IF THE WARSAW PACT LAUNCHES A BATTLE FOR PUBLIC OPINION, OR IF THERE IS A STALEMATE IN THE NEGOTIATION, THE ALLIES WILL NEED THEIR PRESENT STRONG POSITION ON DATA.

2. CANADIAN REP SAID THAT PARA 4 A IN THE DUTCH TEXT (REACHING AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS WITHOUT SPECIFYING COMMON CEILING) WOULD BRING THE EMPHASIS OF THE NEGOTIATION AWAY FROM THE COMMON CEILING AND TOWARD ASYMMETRIC REDUCTIONS. THIS EMPHASIS WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO NEGOTIATION WITH THE PACT, AND WOULD NOT HELP WITH ALLIED PUBLIC OPINION. HE SAID THAT PARA 4 B IN THE DUTCH TEXT (REACHING AGREEMENT ON COMMON CEILING WITHOUT SPECIFYING REDUCTIONS) WOULD RAISE TWO PROBLEMS. FIRST, IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO PARTICIPATE IN REDUCTIONS WITHOUT ANY MENTION OF THE FORCES TO BE REDUCED (IT WOULD BE PARTICULARLY DIFFICULT TO EXPLAIN THIS TO PARLIAMENTS). SECOND, THIS APPROACH WOULD BE EXTREMELY DIFFICULT TO VERIFY.

3. CANADIAN REP SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WERE DISPOSED TO HAVE THE MBFR WORKING GROUP STUDY THE MILITARY-TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE DUTCH PROPOSAL. IF THE WG UNDERTOOK SUCH A STUDY, CANADA WOULD PARTICIPATE AND GIVE ITS VIEWS.

4. UK REP (BAILES) SAID THAT UK HAD MADE CLEAR ITS VIEW OF THE IMPORTANCE OF PRESSING THE EAST FOR AN EXCHANGE OF DATA WHEN SPC WAS WORKING ON EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL. UK LIKE CANADA, DID NOT WANT TO ADOPT A MINIMALIST APPROACH ON DATA, BUT WANTED TO CONTINUE TO PRESS THE OTHER SIDE. LONDON CONSIDERED THE DUTCH PAPER AN INTERESTING THINK-PIECE, AND WELCOMED IT AS AN ATTEMPT TO LOOK AT QUESTIONS WHICH NEED STUDY. UK HAS SAME DOUBTS REGARDING
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00644 01 OF 02 061942Z

OPTIONS IN PARA 4 OF DUTCH PAPER AS DOES CANADA, AND UK HAS NO PROBLEM IN EXAMINING THE DUTCH PAPER WITHIN THE ALLIANCE. UK FAVORS PUTTING THE SHOLE PAPER INTO THE MBFR WORKING GROUP FOR MILITARY ANALYSIS. UK DOES NOT REGARD THE DUTCH PAPER AS SOMETHING WHICH WOULD CHANGE ALLIED TACTICS IN VIENNA.

5. FRG REP (CITRON) SAID BONN ALSO CONSIDERED THE DUTCH TEXT AN INTERESTING DOCUMENT. HOWEVER, ITS TUDY SHOULD NOT TAKE PLACE UNDER TIME PRESSURE. HE AGREED WITH THE CANADIAN AND UK REMARKS. FRG SEES NO REASON FOR THE ALLIES TO ABANDON THEIR EFFORT TO DISCUSS DATA WITH THE OTHER SIDE. THE ALLIES NEED TO BE ABLE TO SPEAK ABOUT DATA TO MAKE THEIR POINT ON DISPARITIES, WITH RESPECT TO ALLIED GOAL OF ASYMMETRICAL GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS LEADING TO A

COMMON CEILING. FRG REP SAID FRGREGARDS DUTCH PARA 4 A AS A FIRST STEP TOWARD ABANDONMENT OF THE COMMON CEILING, AND PARA 4 B AS HARDLY PRACTICABLE. HE STRESSED THAT THE ALLIED NEED TO LAY DOWN REDUCTION QUOTAS FOR US AND SOVIET REDUCTIONS IN PHASE I AND TO ACHIEVE AN UPPER LIMIT ON SOVIET FORCES. THE DUTCH PAPER WAS AN INTERESTING THINK-PIECE, BUT THE TWO ALTERNATIVES ARE NOT A SUITABLE BASIS FOR A CHANGE IN THE ALLIED POSITION NOW. FRG RECOMMENDED THAT THE SPC ASK THE MBFR WG TO STUDY MILITARY-TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE DUTCH PAPER.

6. MC REP (GROUP CAPTAIN SMITH) ON PERSONAL BASIS SAID HE READ THE DUTCH PAPER AS MORE OF A THINK-PIECE THAN A RECOMMENDATION FOR A SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE IN ALLIED POLICY. HE OBSERVED THAT THE PAPER CONCENTRATED ONLY ON THE MANPOWER ISSUE. HE NOTED THAT THE ALLIED OBJECTIVE IN PHASE I IS REDUCTION OF A UNIT, I.E. A SOVIET TANK ARMY. THE NUMBER OF MEN IN THAT UNIT, WHETHER 50,000 OR 75,000, MIGHT NOT BE CRUCIAL, BUT THAT UNIT WOULD HAVE TO BE SPECIFIED TO MEET THE ALLIED PHASE I OBJECTIVE. THIS WAS A REASON FOR CONCERN ABOUT THE OPTION IN THE DUTCH PARA 4 B. HE SAID THE WG WOULD BE HAPPY TO TAKE THE DUTCH PAPER UNDER REVIEW.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 00644 02 OF 02 061954Z

46

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 057401

R 061735Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 9965

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0644

7. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) NOTED THAT THE DUTCH DO CONSIDER THEIR PAPER AS A THINK-PIECE, AND HAVE NO INTENTION OF PROPOSING A CHANGE IN GUIDANCE TO THE AHG AT THIS TIME, OR A CHANGE IN AHG TACTICS REGARDING INSISTENCE ON AN EXCHANGE OF DATA WITH THE OTHER SIDE. HE SAID THAT THE DUTCH SAW AN INTERMEDIATE OPTION, BETWEEN

THE ONES SPECIFIED IN PARAS 4 A AND 4 B OF THE DUTCH TEXT,
I.E. SPECIFYING REDUCTIONS AND THE COMMON CEILING WITHOUT AN
EXCHANGE OF DATA. HE QUESTIONED CANADIAN REP'S REMARKS ON THE
IMPORTANCE OF DATA VIA-A-VIS PUBLIC OPINION, AND THOUGHT DATA
MIGHT NOT BE AS IMPORTANT IN THIS CONTEXT AS THE ALLIES HAVE
THOUGHT UNTIL NOW. IF PUBLIC OPINION WERE GIVEN A CHOICE BETWEEN
THE COMMON CEILING WITHOUT A DATA EXCHANGE, OR NO COMMON CEILING,
PUBLIC OPINION WOULD PREFER THE COMMON CEILING WITHOUT A DATA
EXCHANGE. HE STRESSED, IN RESPONSE TO THE FRG INTERVENTION, THAT
NOTHING WAS FURTHER FROM THE HAGUE'S THOUGHTS IN THIS PAPER THAN TO
ABANDON THE COMMON CEILING. RE CANADIAN REP'S REMARK ON VERIFICATION
PROBLEM POSED BY DUTCH PARA 4 B, NETHERLANDS REP NOTED THAT THE
DUTCH HAD RECOGNIZED THIS PROBLEM RE FRG VIEW THAT ALLIES MUST
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00644 02 OF 02 061954Z

SPEAK ABOUT DATA TO MAKE THEIR POINT ON DISPARITIES, DUTCH REP
SAID HIS AUTHORITIES BELIEVE THAT THE OTHER SIDE WILL NEVER BE
BROUGHT TO EITHER AN EXCHANGE OF DATA OR A FULL RECOGNITION OF
DISPARITIES. NETHERLANDS REP HOPED THAT SPC WOULD ASK WG TO
STUDY MILITARY IMPLICATIONS OF DUTCH PAPER, BUT IT WAS NOT NECESSARY
FOR WG TO PROCEED WITH GREAT SPEED.

8. US REP (MOORE) SAID HE HAD FOUND THE DUTCH PAPER INTERESTING.
HE NOTED THAT THE US MISSION HAD NOT YET RECEIVED ITS INSTRUCTIONS
ON IT, AND HE HOPED TO EXPRESS US VIEWS AT THE SPC MEETING ON
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10. HE SUGGESTED THAT THE SPC POSTPONE UNTIL THAT
TIME ITS DECISION ON SENDING THE PAPER TO THE WG.

9. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON GUIDANCE ON DUTCH PAPER IN TIME
FOR SPC MEETING ON FEBRUARY 10. MISSION RECOMMENDS THAT THE US
GO ALONG WITH FRG, UK AND CANADA ON SENDING THE MATTER TO THE
MBFR WG FOR A NON-URGENT WG STUDY WHICH WOULD CONCERN MILITARY-
TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DUTCH APER.
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 06 FEB 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO00644
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750286/abbrziau.tel
Line Count: 201
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: USNATO 536
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 31 MAR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <31 MAR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <02 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: DUTCH PAPER ON DATA : SPC DISCUSSION FEBRUARY 6
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
LONDON
MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006